

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/700,956	11/21/2000	James McLaren	50199/002001	4691
21559 7	590 06/30/2003			
CLARK & El			EXAMINER	
101 FEDERAL STREET BOSTON, MA 02110			SHERRER, CURTIS EDWARD	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1761	
			DATE MAILED: 06/30/2003	/3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			SAI			
9.	Application No.	Applicant(s)	7			
Advisory Action	09/700,956	MCLAREN, JAMES				
	Examin r	Art Unit				
	Curtis E. Sherrer	1761				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover shet with the	correspondence addr	ess			
THE REPLY FILED 09 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE TO Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this appli 1) a timely filed amendment wh	cation. A proper rep ich places the applic	ly to a ation in			
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ad event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exter 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortene (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the nan SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE ate on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. Insign and the corresponding amount of the distatutory period for reply originally set in	of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. So 136(a) and the appropriate the fee. The appropriate extention or (extension fee extension fee ension fee under 2) as set forth in			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>06/09/03</u> . Appella 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF						
$2. \boxtimes$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	pecause:					
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);	•			
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c)	in better form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or s	implifying the			
(d) $oxed{\boxtimes}$ they present additional claims without cance	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claim	ıs.			
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for application in condition for allowance because: S		sidered but does NO	T place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which wer	re newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims we	• • •	•	and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	:					
Claim(s) allowed: None.						
Claim(s) objected to: None.						
Claim(s) rejected: 20-39						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	s a)□ approved or b)□ disap	proved by the Exam	iner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	//	2/			
10. Other:	,					
S. Patent and Trademark Office		Curtis E. Sherrer Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1761				

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant has not provided specificational basis for their definition of mineral-enriched yeast. While applicant refers to Table 3 and 4, it would be expected that live yeast would produce more ethanol than dead yeast.